



States Supreme Court at any time prior to March 1, 2014, and could be accompanied by either an agreed or involuntary stay.

2. In the meantime, based on the decision itself, it is not appropriate for this Court to simply enter an order compelling arbitration without more, as Defendant's motion and proposed order suggest. The Court of Appeals' decision included the following statement:

We conclude that the PartnerPlus Plan's lack of a class waiver does not relieve the Plaintiffs from their independent obligation to submit their claim to arbitration based on the Compensation Plan. Nevertheless, having concluded that the Compensation Plan's arbitration provision requires the Plaintiffs to submit their claim to arbitration, we leave for the FINRA arbitration panel to decide whether the class waiver requires the Plaintiffs to arbitrate on an individual basis.

In support of that proposition, the Court of Appeals cited Green Tree Fin. Corp. v. Bazzle, 539 U.S. 444, 451 (2003), addressing the issue of class arbitration. The decision, however, also cited Petrofac, Inc. v. DynMcDermott Petroleum Operations Co., 687 F.3d 671, 675 (5th Cir. 2012), addressing the threshold issue of arbitrability, and observed, with respect to the issue of arbitrability tied to Plaintiffs' request for injunctive relief:

Nevertheless, in light of the Plaintiffs' broad request for all appropriate equitable relief under §1132(a)(3) and our conclusion that the dispute must, in the first instance, be sent to arbitration, we leave the initial decision of the scope of arbitration to the arbitration panel. See Bazzle, 539 U.S. at 451; Petrofac, 687 F.3d at 675.

In footnote 4 of its decision, finally, the Court of Appeals also further deferred to an arbitration panel the determination of the effect of FINRA Rule 13204, "provid[ing] that a '[c]lass action claim[ ] may not be arbitrated,'" stating, "[h]aving concluded that the arbitration clause in the Compensation Plan requires arbitration, we leave for the arbitrator to determine this rule's potential effect of the arbitration proceedings."

3. By refusing, as indicated, to resolve threshold issues of arbitrability, including the scope of arbitration, tied to enforceability of the class waiver and Plaintiffs' request for injunctive

PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S RENEWED  
MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFFS' COMPLAINT AND COMPEL ARBITRATION - Page 2

relief, the Court of Appeals recognized that the FINRA arbitration panel may actually find Plaintiffs' claims not arbitrable at all, or only in part, and may, under Rule 13204, throw all or part of Plaintiffs' claims back to this Court. In light of these possibilities, the order to be entered should stay, rather than dismiss, this action, pending an arbitration panel's decision as to enforceability of the class waiver and the significance of Plaintiffs' request for injunctive relief, and the implication of a determination of such issues under FINRA Rule 13204. Any order compelling arbitration should further specifically direct the arbitration panel, as a threshold matter, to address the questions of arbitrability, including scope of arbitration, tied to such issues and also address the issue of class arbitration.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs request that the Court enter an order in the form of that attached rather than the order proposed by Defendant.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Robert E. Goodman, Jr.  
Robert E. Goodman, Jr., Lead Attorney  
State Bar No. 08158100  
reg@kilgorelaw.com  
Theodore C. Anderson  
State Bar No. 01215700  
tca@kilgorelaw.com  
Ashley E. Tremain  
State Bar No. 24066209  
aet@kilgorelaw.com  
Kilgore & Kilgore PLLC  
3109 Carlisle Street  
Dallas, Texas 75204  
(214) 969-9099; (214) 953-0133 (telecopy)

Peter K. Stris (*pro hac vice*)  
peter.stris@strismaher.com  
Victor O'Connell (*pro hac vice*)  
victor.oconnell@strismaher.com  
Stris & Maher LLP  
19210 S. Vermont Ave.  
Building E  
Gardena, California 90248  
(424) 212-7090; (424) 212-7001 (telecopy)

Brendan S. Maher  
State Bar No. 24053336  
brendan.maher@strismaher.com  
Stris & Maher LLP  
4144 N. Central Expy., Suite 1230  
Dallas, Texas 75204  
(214) 736-4524; (214) 594-5897 (telecopy)

Brian E. Bro  
State Bar No. 03030000  
brian@bebroatty.com  
Law Offices of Brian E. Bro  
3200 SW Freeway, Suite 2200  
Houston, Texas 77027  
(713) 961-3111; (281) 265-9181(telecopy)

Sam F. Baxter  
State Bar No. 01938000  
sbaxter@mckoolsmith.com  
Theodore Stevenson, III  
State Bar No. 19196650  
tstevenson@mckoolsmith.com  
Jennifer L. Truelove  
State Bar No. 24012906  
jtruelove@mckoolsmith.com  
McKool Smith, PC  
104 East Houston Street, Suite 300  
Marshall, Texas 75670  
(903) 923-9000; (903) 923-9099 (telecopy)

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFFS

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served upon Defendant's counsel of record through this Court's electronic filing system this 20th day of December, 2013 as follows:

Eugene Scalia  
Paul Blankenstein  
William J. Kilberg  
Gibson Dunn  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Michael C. Smith  
Siebman, Burg, Phillips & Smith, LLP  
113 East Austin Street  
Marshall, Texas 75670

/s/ Robert E. Goodman, Jr.  
Robert E. Goodman, Jr.